GANDHIAN EPISTEME OF VIOLENCE AND THE CONTEMPORARY INDIAN MARGINALITY

Dr. Akbar Chawdhary
Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi, India

Abstract:

Gandhi ahimsa is a mode of overcoming the fear of colonial apparatus in the colonized subject, whereas for many violence is a mode of self-constitution for the colonized subject. Both these concepts are in effect steps towards harnessing the ineffable potentials inherent in human existence. Here I try to interrogate which concept can actually lead to the emancipation of the downtrodden masses of India particularly Dalits and Adivasis. This problem takes inspiration from my own participatory engagement with the Adivasis recently and dwells on the question as to which of the above line of thought actually brings us closer to a possible solution. When we imagine a just-society, do Gandhian mode captures the essence of the lived realities of the struggling marginal voices in today's India? If not, what is the other way to think through? This is also an attempt to force us to rethink the Gandhian position on Ahimsa. I believe for the liberation of marginal voices, we need to redefine Gandhi's position on Ahimsa as the position of minimum violence. Further, I argue that a position of violence is necessary for Dalit masses as a revolutionary strategy of building an alternative through a denunciation of all the psychological baggage imposed by hegemonic culture as argued by Fanon. I believe it's important to go beyond the current policy emphasis on redistribution and representation and need to bring into centre stage the often ignored issues of recognition as social capital among Adivasis and Dalits in Gandhi's India. Now more than searching for the solution, it's important to look for a method of engagement with the lived experience of Dalits and Adivasis as categories to philosophically engage with on-ground beyond desk research. A true philosophical search should be measured by taking (wo)man as the measure of it, in real time. That's why it's important to engage with the pressing living problem of one's time and space and therefore this article attempts to rethink the content of the available concepts vis-a-vis contemporary Indian marginality.

Key-words: Gandhi, Ahimsa, Modernity, Marginality, Tribals.

Introduction: Emancipating the Colonized Subject

This paper is an attempt to understand violence as a mechanism for reclaiming of post-colonial self while considering Gandhi as a central pole of the discourse. Gandhi holds a very important place in the histories of former British colonisation. Not only he was instrumental in mobilizing the masses against colonialism –through his activism and political writings – but even now in post-colonial states he remains in the midst of discussions and has assumed an iconic status. The ideas of Gandhi have been able to transcend his historical and geographical boundaries and has proved his mettle by remaining constant reference points for struggles and movements which are far diverse in scope and objective. This glorious afterlife and continued relevance of Gandhi in the contemporary struggles cannot be relegated to cursory eulogistic footnotes of history that iconizes him as figures of the past but has to be seen in the intrinsic strength of his theorization. It needs to be recognized that Gandhi was not merely a proponent of anti-colonial struggles in India, but the struggle impregnated his vision with the broad rubric of the dehumanizing content of colonialism. It is this vision that propelled him to chart a thoroughgoing critique of the colonial culture which had got naturalized in the lives of the colonized people. His strategies bear witness to the fact that they were not merely pragmatic modifications and manoeuvres adopted under the burden of circumstances, as many critics like to believe, but articulations that conveyed the larger picture of colonial destruction of native culture to the broader masses so that the people themselves could participate in the process of rejuvenating from the ruins of colonial culture.

In my attempt to understand the Gandhian methodology of non-violent realisation of Self, I also attempt to understand the underlying political and historical forces that inform Gandhi. It will be crucial to refer his works in light of the conditions that he encounters. In order to contextualize the development of his ideas, it will be immensely important to understand the discourses that inform his politics. Therefore, a discursive analysis of his texts has been applied which immediately place his works and texts amidst a network of other texts. While accounting for the discourses that had influenced the positions and formulations Gandhi, we should not forget that discourses do not operate as unified wholes of religion, ethics, revolutionary programs or national imaginary, rather it operates as dispersed and fragmented universe ordered on a multiplicity of tacit relations and principles. Therefore, discursive analysis is essentially the study of these orders and the principles and relations that govern these orders. Michel Foucault's comment on the nature of the orders is worth recalling in this context. Foucault said—

Order is, at one and the same time, that which is given in things as their inner law, the hidden network that determines the way they confront one another, and also that which has no existence except in the grid created by a glance, an examination, a language; and it is only in the blank spaces of this grid that order manifests itself in depth as though already there, waiting in silence for the moment of its

expression."[1]

Within this methodological framework, Gandhi's pronouncements on truth and evocative presentation of the colonized subject as a *satyagrahi* have to be seen in the light of Gandhi's articulation of the anti-colonial subject. Gandhi was aware that the colonized subject was a mutilated being produced by colonial culture. Gandhi's ideas almost resonate on the concern they shared about the Manichaeism of colonial and anti-colonial culture. The cult of hatred that blinds man from the realization of his rational being is part of the human finitude that colonial oppression rewrites in history and the only way out of this finitude is latent in the possibility of harnessing the ineffable possibilities of self realization that exists in the love and humanity towards the general species. Gandhi attempt this almost impossible task of rejuvenating the ineffable in order to overcome the finitude that colonial condition imposes. The practices of a *satyagrahi* and the warm affection the native feels towards the settlers sincere to the cause of liberation, the seeking after truth that Gandhi prescribes to overcome the dehumanizing effect of colonialism and the maturity attains by assessing the mistakes wholeheartedly in the ebb and tide of struggle paves the way towards the broader realization of freedom of the entire mankind. It is this primacy ascribed to emancipating the colonized subject from the finitude imposed by colonial condition by harnessing his human potential for the care of the other and awakening him to the cause of the emancipation of entire humanity that is responsible for making Gandhi constant reference points for future struggles.

Gandhi's Anti-colonial project and Indian Modernity

In the Gandhian anti-colonial project if *ahimsa* is a mode of overcoming the fear of colonial apparatus in the colonized subject, one can argue other way round as well, that violence too can be seen as a mode of self-constitution for the colonized subject. Both these concepts are in effect steps towards harnessing the ineffable potentials inherent in human existence. Indian Modernity and colonialism are inalienably linked in the context of the colonized nations. The development of modern institutions like education, judiciary and health went hand in hand with the violent destruction of the native systems. Similarly in the realm of knowledge colonized nations witnessed a form of hybrid culture where modern systems of knowledge based on scientific rationality coexisted with traditional forms of knowledge in an ambience of mixed feelings that can neither deny nor accept completely. Modernity was essentially a European condition and all the institutions of modernity, like state, public sphere, citizenship and human rights "all bear the burden of European thought and history. One simply cannot think of political modernity without these and other related concepts that found a climactic form in the course of European Enlightenment and nineteenth century."[2] Chakrabarty has clearly shown the roots of the crisis that entails a colonial development and modernity. The European colonizers who preached enlightenment humanism and violated it in practice created a fertile ground of resistance in the native population.[3] But the discourse of resistance was not homogeneous and its heterogeneity was determined by the class divisions in the native population. The ambivalence that Bhabha has pointed out in *Location of Culture* manufactured different discourses of resistance across different classes in the native population based on the positions of these classes in the colonial setup. Ranajit Guha has shown how the resistance in the upper classes and subaltern classes varied in the context of peasant insurgency in India.[4] Guha has also shown that the articulation of the anti-colonial project of resistance in case of India has always taken into account the need to address and somewhere bring together these dispersed forms of resistance into a broader nationalist paradigm. It is in this complexity of political positions one has to understand the vitality of the anti-colonial projects. Moreover, the survey of the positions of postcolonial commentators, the works of Ashish Nandy and Homi K. Bhabha expands our understanding of how Gandhi anti-colonial project had a great role in theorizing the questions of modernity, nationalism and identity. The subaltern studies group gives a brilliant exposition of how Gandhi mediated between the popular consciousness of the subaltern classes and appropriated the insurgent mass assertion of the lower classes for the bourgeois nationalist project.

Gandhi's idea of modernity and nationalism has also been commented upon with scepticism by Rabindranath Tagore and Shri Aurobindo. While Tagore was critical about Gandhi's preponderance with Indian civilization which he believed restricted the Indian culture from assimilating the progressive elements of western civilization. He was also concerned about the monstrosities of nationalist spirit in the west and wary of the overzealous adherence to "satyagraha" and "Swadeshi" movements. In his novels *Home and the World* and *Gora* Tagore has portrayed how the Satyagraha and swadeshi movement had actually created a rift in Hindus and Muslims. Tagore had conveyed to Gandhi about his discomfort at the continued alienation of the Muslims in the nationalist discourse. Shri Aurobindo on the other hand was sceptical about the real mettle of the Gandhian spirituality. Though he did not ever narrate his differences with Gandhi, he maintained that Gandhi's methods were at best an essentialization of some aspects of the universal philosophy of Hinduism.

Deconstructing the Dehumanisation of the Self

It's significant to outline a comparative analysis of the anti-colonial project of Frantz Fanon and Gandhi, as both of them represents two important extremes of the discourse on violence. It's important to question the foundational assumptions of both these projects from the

[1] See "Preface." in Michel Foucault. The Order of Things. p. xxi

[2] See Dipesh Chakrabarty. Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference. P.4.

[3] Both Dipesh Chakrabarty and Homi K. Bhabha have drawn attention to this aspect of colonial discourse. Bhabha in his essay "Of Mimicry and Man: The Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse". in Location of culture. P. 85-87. Bhabha says that colonial discourse operates through a mimicry or a farce of its own which functions by presenting a virtual colonial subject for propagating the exploitation through the modern institutions.

[4] See the chapter on "Negation" in Ranajit Guha. Elementary Aspects of Peasant Insurgency in Colonial India. London: Duke University Press, 1999. P. 18-76

perspective of the historical, political, philosophical and ethical discourses that Gandhi and others had to negotiate with. Therefore it's important to analyse the specificities of the colonial contexts of India and it's contribution to the formulation of the ideas of anti-colonial struggle as a non violent struggle in Gandhi? India was a colony by indirect rule. British Colonial power maintained a state of quasi-autonomy for the native bourgeoisie. The resistance movements, as brilliantly put by Fanon in the *Wretched of the Earth*, which more often than not were led by nationalist intellectuals from the disenchanted native bourgeoisie carried the marks which were indicative of the relation that the latter had with the colonial power. The intellectual traditions and the epistemic paradigms propagated by both the traditional culture and the colonial setup had a crucial role in determining the contours of the anti-colonial project of Gandhian mode of non-violent struggle.

After tracing the historical discourses that informed the ideas of Gandhi, the two phases of Gandhi's political life—in South Africa (1893-1914) and in India, from the setting up of the Sabarmati Ashram in 1915 till the end of his life, Gandhi's positions on Hinduism, *dharma, satyagraha* and non-violence should be seen in the light of the political questions that he encounters and philosophical answers that he proposes. Gandhi propose an analysis of native culture. This analysis was indebted to the dominant intellectual traditions of his time. Gandhi's outlook was deeply ingrained in the nationalist framework of Hindu revivalist movement in India. A close reading of the influence of classical traditionalists like Lev Tolstoy and Henry Thoroeau, who emphasized the role of moral action for systemic change; along with the ideas of universal harmony and love propounded by the "bhakti movement" becomes crucial in understanding the political philosophy of Gandhi. Fanon on the contrary was greatly impressed by the socialist political philosophy of the time which was registering significant victories in the pre-existing colonies. Fanon was responding to the works of Aime Cesaire and other African Nationalists. He was also greatly influenced by the political debates carried out by Jean Paul Sartre in defence of socialism. Infact Jean Paul Sartre's preface to the *Wretched of the Earth* polemically outlines the radical potential of Fanon's project for the European readers. It elaborates on the psycho-somatic process which Fanon had systematically analyzed in *Wretched of the Earth*. Fanon's defence of violence should also be seen in the light of the contending philosophical influences of the French existentialists and the Marxist defense of the legitimate violence of the oppressed.

At an epistemic level Gandhi and Fanon negotiated with modernity and colonialism through two different strategies. While Gandhi took recourse to a moral technology of self by espousing the universal Hindu religious essence and thereby calling for a revivalism of spirit, Fanon attempted a revolutionary strategy of building an alternative through a denunciation of all the psychological baggage imposed by colonial culture. Both these strategies have been historically associated with the idea of nationalism. While Gandhi believed in the ascendance of a new national culture based on the value system of a transcendental Hindu philosophy, Fanon was quite unapologetic about the failure of all national models. Fanon's criticism of national culture is a crucial point to understand the present day crisis.

It's interesting to trace the similarities in the strategies of Gandhi and Fanon as organic intellectual in assuming a vanguard role in anti-colonial struggle to understand the role of violence in present day resistance movements lead by dalits in India at large. Both Gandhi and Fanon recognized the immense potential in the illiterate rural masses in the anti-colonial struggle. Similarly, their strategy of anti-colonial struggle emanated from a philosophical understanding of the formation of the self in the native population under the oppression of colonial authority. While both Gandhi and Fanon were dismayed by the violence that colonial culture wrecks upon the native culture, Gandhi believed that a rejection of the colonial culture manifested in the form of Modernism was possible by spiritual adoption of the ancient Indian culture. As opposed to this, though converging on the premise of the violence inflicted by the colonial culture over native culture, Fanon argued that all attempts to restore a pristine native culture is destined to fail and the only reconciliation for the native is to aspire for a revolutionary anti-colonial culture.

These differences of Gandhi and Fanon on the question of violence in their anti-colonial struggle is an important point to understand the way out today. For Gandhi and Fanon the question of violence was more of a practical philosophical nature than of a universal ethical one. For Fanon violence was a self constituting activity while for Gandhi abeyance from it was a means to the realization of the inner potential of the self that colonial violence attempts to erase. While Fanon projected violence as a tactic of registering the natives resistance to the dehumanization of the colonizer, non-violent "satyagraha", for Gandhi, was a method of rendering the dehumanizing machines of colonialism ineffective in the face of the moral fortitude of the "satyagrahi". The question of death also appears differently in Gandhi and Fanon. While Gandhi's position is situated in the philosophical belief that the soul is immortal therefore physical death is inconsequential, death for Fanon was a political existential statement of asserting the cause of liberation.

Understanding Gandhian Epistemology of Non-violent Popular Resistance

The anti-colonial projects of Frantz Fanon and M K Gandhi have often been the rallying point of two diametrically opposed camps of theorists. The passionate defence of Fanon's clarion call of violent overthrow of colonialism and a dismayed quest for a universal humanist paradigm amidst the ruins of western modernity and humanism in Gandhi's "satyagraha", has more or less been the dominant theme of the debate. While it goes without saying that the difference in the ideological and political formulations of these two figures are actually informed by their divergent class politics, it will be uncritical to overlook the common concerns and astonishing similarities that both of them share in their strategy and tactics of popular resistance against colonialism and modernity.

A complex set of historical and political factors contributed to the development of the vision of anti-colonial struggle in these two figures. The unities and dispersions, the conjunctures and departures, unless explored in the light of the historical and political milieu that both Gandhi and Fanon were encountering, interpreting and responding to, will gravitate towards reinforcing the utopic notions about both the anti-colonial projects erasing the contingencies that had a constitutive role to play in the formulation of the ideas associated with the projects. Neither Gandhi nor Fanon had any illusions about accentuating their political vision according to the

contingencies or the practical demands of the time. Gandhi wrote in the preface to the English translation of *Hind Swaraj* that had it not been his knowledge that the danger of the methods of violence becoming popular he would have refrained from reducing his views to writing, for the sake of the struggle.[5] Similarly, Fanon makes every attempt to distinguish the contingency of violence and its constitutive role on the consciousness of the illiterate rural masses embroiled in the primordial violence of necessity as opposed to the violence of the people emancipated from necessity.[6]

While the contingencies of time were one of the crucial elements that shaped the ideas of Gandhi and Fanon, the role of the epistemic and psychosocial moment cannot be overlooked. Both Gandhi and Fanon underwent their tortuous encounter with modernity mediated through the experience of colonialism. While for Gandhi modernity was essentially linked to the materialistic philosophy of the west, best expressed in the machines of production. In *Hind Swaraj* Gandhi's comment on machinery is worth mentioning here—"Machinery has begun to desolate Europe. Ruination is knocking at the English gates. Machinery is the chief symbol of modern civilization; it represents a great sin."[7] Gandhi's denunciation of machines and his idea of contesting the evil of modernity as he says in the last part of the dialogue in *Hind Swaraj*—"It is necessary to realize that machinery is bad. We shall then be able gradually to do away with it."[8] shows that Gandhi contested modernity through two distinct strategies. Ashish Nandy has pointed out that Gandhi like "critical traditionalists" reemphasized a model of self-control and self-realization to counter modernity. Nandy also shows that in doing so he has also substituted the historical determinism that western notion of rational history based on linear causality, with a mythical history of Asiatic cultures where the present moment can move towards a rupture without depending on the demands of time through sheer moral intervention.[9] However, for Gandhi, though the present moment can be changed by moral practices of the self, he does not believe in the lack of a past. For Gandhi, the "past" is not a temporal element like western history but an essence which has been corrupted but can be restored through practices of the self that shirks the philosophy of corruption and immerses himself in the practical acts of realizing that essence. Fanon's response to modernity however, was of a different order. Like Gandhi, Fanon also claims that the colonial culture imposes itself on the native. He said in *Black Skin/ White Masks*--

> Every colonized people—in other words, every people in whose soul an inferiority complex has been created by the death and burial of its local cultural originality— finds itself face to face with the language of the civilizing nation; that is, with the culture of the mother country. The colonized is elevated above his jungle status in proportion to his adoption of the mother country's cultural standards. He becomes whiter as he renounces his blackness, his jungle[10]

It shows that for Fanon colonial modernity poses a psychosomatic problem. He says the Negro is always an abnormal, a "phobogenic", that is his existence is preceded by a phobia. For Fanon, this psychosomatic condition is not moral but psychologically deterministic. It is from this understanding of historical objectivity that Fanon charts his strategy. He completely denounces the notion of past or essence—"The discovery of the existence of a Negro civilization in the fifteenth century confers no patent of humanity on me. Like it or not, the past can in no way guide me in the present moment."[11] As opposed to Gandhi, Fanon condemns all attempts of disalienation as deemed to failure which refuses "to accept the present as definitive". He claims:

> The problem considered here is one of time. Those Negroes and white men will be disalienated who refuse to let themselves sealed away in the materialized Tower of the Past. For many other Negroes, in other ways, disalienation will come into being through their refusal to accept the present as definitive.[12]

Therefore one can see that Fanon does not discard the western model of history rather looks for a radical transformation within this epistemic paradigm of time. For him there is no essential negro or a native essence, the ideal conditions of a human world will be created only through "efforts to recapture the self and scrutinize the self.[13] The alternative model of a national culture has been a mode of articulating a response to western modernity in Gandhi. Gandhi's idea of *Swaraj* proposed in *Hind Swaraj* is a polemic against those ideas of nationalism which measures itself in terms of the West's values of economic and political development. For Gandhi nationalism imbued in *swaraj* is a nationalism based on the essence of Indian civilization and it operates in a revivalist approach where the disease

[5] See M. K. Gandhi. Hind Swaraj. P. 8
[6] Frantz Fanon. The Wretched of the Earth. P. 47.
[7] See the chapter on "Machinery" in M. K. Gandhi. Hind Swaraj. P. 107-111
[8] Jagannath Swaroop Mathur. Contemporary Society: A Gandhian Appraisal 'Evolution of Gandhian Economic concepts' Gyan Publishing House. New Delhi. p. 109
[9] This idea of an alternative history grounded in the mythical idea of time as opposed to the linear idea of time central to modern historical discipline has been seen by Ashish Nandy as a promise in Gandhian politics. It is worthwhile to mention that Dipesh Chakrabarty has skeptically commented upon this attitude of theoretical expediency of alternative history in his chapter "Postcoloniality and the Artifice of History" in Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference. Chakrabarty has commented "There is a peculiar way in which all these other histories tend to become variations on a master narrative that could be called "the history of Europe." In this sense,"Indian" history itself is in a position of subalternity; one can only articulate subaltern subject positions in the name of this history." p. 27.
[10] Frantz Fanon, Black Skin, White Masks, p. 18
[11] Frantz Fanon. Black Skin/ White Masks. P.225
[12] Frantz Fanon. Black Skin, White masks. P 176
[13] Ibid. P. 181

inflicted by west has to be conquered for the formers ultimate ascendance.[14]

The post-colonial commentators have responded to Gandhi and Fanon's strategies from different perspectives. Ashish Nandy's reading of the psychological foundations of Gandhian non-violence and Fanon's idea of violence reveals the deeper psychological forces that both these figures were employing in their strategies. However, Nandy seems to endorse the Gandhian understanding of the psychology of colonialism which admits that it is not merely the colonized who is being dehumanized by the colonizer but the colonizer also dehumanizes himself in the process.[15] Ranajit Guha, one of the pioneers of Subaltern Studies, on the other hand, claimed that Gandhi like most bourgeois politicians of his time had a deep distrust for the mass upsurge. But unlike them, he did not denounce it but tried his best harness the potentials by disciplining it. He also claims that "Gandhi's theory of leadership amounted thus to a formula to dissolve the immediacy of mobilization in the subaltern domain, and open up a space for the nationalist elite to step in with its own will, initiative and organization in order to pilot the political activity of the masses towards goals set up by bourgeoise."[16]

Fanon in this regard had a deep distrust of the middle classes and a great faith in the potential of the peasants and illiterate masses in the anti-colonial struggle. His idea of violence has been regarded by Homi Bhaba as a method of splintering the overarching ideas of western rationalism and modernity. The colonized by taking recourse to violence constitutes for himself a new identity that breaks the "overdetermined from without" self of the colonized. His registering of his identity as distinct from the colonized identity shatters the assumptions of western rationalism and modernity and unfold their unequal foundations.[17]

Contemporary Indian Marginality

In the present times, after more than half a century of India's Independence, on the one hand, the Indian Democracy has matured and on the other hand, the polarisation in the society has also grown very sharp. How far Gandhian principles stayed in the process of nation building is an important point to ponder over. The Dalits are still struggling to get their basic due recognition in the society. The struggle is still about getting minimum self-respect. The tribals feel betrayed as even after independence their resources which they consider divine are being taken away in the name of development. The worst sufferer in 21st century are the religious minorities particularly Muslims, whose otherisation has been employed as a tool to create a consciousness for religion based nation of the majority community. To establish a right wing narrative, there is a sustained attempt to delegitimize Gandhi, Gandhian means and a blatant appropriation of his selective ideas to create a narrative of hyper-nationalism. Given this situation, scholars are forced to reconsider the Gandhian ideals of reclaiming the self. His usage of religious symbols to mobilise masses carried the potential to be used for generating the majoritarian sentiment. His invocation of 'Ram-rajya' carried seeds of a violent movement for the demolition of Babri mosque to give space to build a Ram-temple. Of course, there is no seemingly direct connect between the two, but the Self which Gandhi was trying to constitute in the post-colonial India was susceptible to such manipulation as well. With the rise of right-wing populism, it's a primary question for the downtrodden masses to choose the way forward to reclaim their space in the democracy. The Gandhian ideals, which largely invoked a moral sentiment against the British regime was successful as the British were outsiders and it was comparatively easy for the masses to understand the nuances of the moral argument. But when the fight for right is within the countrymen more than the moral pressures a sectarian psychosomatic jealousy works dominantly. This state of affairs has forced the struggling masses to enact and follow Gandhian principles as principle of minimum violence not complete submission to non-violence. Even in the heydays of the freedom movement, during the Quit india movement, Gandhi raised the slogan of "do or die". This position is close to a Fanonian position that death should be considered as a statement of resistance and political liberation. Before this Gandhi has always treated physical death of no significance in the resistance movement.

Moreover, when State, which has the legitimate right over violence goes berserk and the small functionaries within the State use violence to feed the general communal common sense, there is no other way out in front of the fighting masses then to respond in a similar fashion. A resistance movement where your appeal to moral and democratic values of the state goes continually unheard, a position of minimum violence is absolutely justified. It at least raises the self-esteem of the fighting masses to continue the struggle. After years of institutional mechanism like reservation for the dalit community, there developed a upwardly mobile class which is taking proud in all those perennial instigations, which were once a tool for their humiliation. This is similar to the method suggested by Fanon years back, to follow a revolutionary strategy of building an alternative through a denunciation of all the psychological baggage. It's in clear contrast to what Gandhi will expect from the people to suffer themselves for the change of heart of the brahmanical forces. An almost similar case goes with Tribals in India. During my own field work, I realised that in the mainstream narrative of the nation building, Tribals are can't be treated as just mere equal citizenry. To treat them as equal one need to give them special provisions in all walks of life. Tribal masses are struggling to keep pace with the urban fast changing so called mainstream. Since the rules and regulations are all set by the mainstream and in utter disregard of the conventions and laws of the forestry, tribals find it difficult to get in-sync with it. This points out towards the similar problem of recognition as faced by dalits in the country. In a democracy violence should not have a place but when the regulations itself acts in an exclusionary mode, when the state legitimises an ongoing structural violence and people remain insensitive to even consider it a problem, it's important to rethink the content of the popular concepts like non-violence.

[14] M. K Gandhi. Hind Swaraj. P. 72
[15] See "The Psychology of Colonialism", in Ashish Nandy. Intimate Enemy. 1997. P. 46-54
[16] Ranajit Guha. Dominance without Hegemony. p.143
[17] See "Interrogating Fanon and the Postcolonial Prerogative". In Homi K. Bhaba. Location of Culture. P. 40-65

References:

- Allessandrini, Anthony C. *Frantz Fanon: Critical Perspectives.* London: Routledge, 1999.
- Bhabha, Homi K. *Location of Culture.* New York: Routledge, 1994.
- Borman, William. *Gandhi's Nonviolence.* Albany: State Unversity of New York Press , 1986.
- Caute, David. *Frantz Fanon.* New York: The Viking Press, 1970.
- Coward, Harold, ed. *Indian Critiques of Gandhi.* Albany: State University of New York Press, 2003.
- Fanon, Frantz. *A Dying Colonialism.* New York: Monthly Press, 1965.
- Fanon, Frantz. *Black Skin White Masks.* Translated by Charles Lam Markmann. London: Pluto Press, 2008.
- Fanon, Frantz. *The Wretched of the Earth:The handbook for the Black Revolution That is Changing the Shape of the World.* New York: Grove Press Inc., 1968.
- Federeci, Sylvia. "Journey to the Native Land: Violence and the Concept of the Self in Fanon and Gandhi." *Quest Philosophical Discussion: An international African Journal of Philosophy* 8, no. 2 (1994): 47-70.
- Foucault, Michel. *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of Human Sciences.* New York: Vintage books, Random House, 1970.
- Gandhi, M. K. *Hind Swaraj.* Edited by Anthony J. Parel. New York: Cambridge University press, 1997.
- Gramsci, A. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks.* Edited by Q. Hoare and G.N Smith. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1971.
- Guha, Ranajit. *Dominance without Hegemony: History and Power in Colonial India.* London: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Howard, Neil. "Freedom and Development in Historical Context:A comaparison of Gandhi and Fanon's Approaches to Liberation." *The Journal of Pan African Studies* 4, no. 7 (Nov 2011): 94-109.
- Jan Mohamed, A.R. "The Economy of Manichean Allegory: The function of Racial Difference in Colonialist Literature." *Critical Inquiry* 12 (1985): 59-87.
- Nandy, Ashish. *The Intimate Enemy: Loss and recovery of Self Under Colonialism.* New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1983.
- Parry, B. "Problems in Current Theories of Colonial Discourse." *Oxford Literary Review* 9, no. 1-2 (1988): 27-58.
- Singh, Hira."Confronting Colonialism and Racism: Fanon and Gandhi." *Human Architecture: Journal of the Sociology of Self Knowledge* 5, no. 3 (2007): 341-352.